

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present Amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24-30 are pending. In the present Amendment, Claims 9, 15, 16, and 29 are currently amended and new Claim 30 is added. Support for the present Amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 10, line 23 to page 11, line 3, at page 20, lines 22-25, at page 55, line 3 to page 57, line 25, and in Figures 2, 3, 13, and 14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 9-16, 18, 21, 24, and 26-28 were rejected as unpatentable over Shropshire (International Publication No. WO 02/05981) in view of Alibozek (non-patent document titled "Smart Software Builds a Better Harness"), and further in view of Yamashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,750) and Yoon (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,387); Claims 19, 22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, Yamashita, and Yoon, and further in view of Ozaki (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,537); and Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, Yamashita, and Yoon, and further in view of Ida (U.S. Patent No. 6,276,477).

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections and traverse these rejections, as discussed below.

The method for synthesis of a routing of a vehicle recited in Claim 9 is hereby amended to better clarify how the user can switch back and forth between the various views to synthesize the routing. Specifically, Claim 9 recites "switching back and forth between the first view and the second view such that, in the first view, the valid routings between the zones are displayed without showing the valid routings within the zones and, in the second view, the valid routings within the zones are displayed."

Accordingly, as can be seen in the exemplary embodiment shown in Figures 13 and 14, the first view is an overview of all of the zones of the vehicle and the second view shows one or more zones in a more detailed view. As the first overall view does not include all of the detail of each zone, the user is able to easily navigate between the zones of the vehicle. Further, when the user selects a particular zone in which to work, the second view shows the user all of the details of the routing. When the user wishes to move to another zone, the user can switch back to the first view and easily find the new zone because the routings in the zone are hidden.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 9.

The Office Action cites the combination of Shropshire, Alibozek, Yamashita, and Yoon to reject independent Claim 9. In the last paragraph on page 4, the Office Action relies on Yamashita as describing the first view on the display. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figures 3-5 of Yamashita as describing “that the lines among terminals are not shown but connectivity among sections are shown because some are indicated as prohibited.”

Applicants respectfully traverse this position. Specifically, Yamashita does not disclose or suggest that the individual components shown in Figures 3-5 have valid routings *within each component*. Thus, Figures 3-5 of Yamashita show individual components, and do not show a plurality of zones that were divided from a vehicle. Accordingly, Figures 3-5 of Yamashita do not display the claimed first view.

The Office Action further relies on Yoon as describing the second view on the display. Yoon describes a wire harness system having a data information window 500 that shows a global harness map 530 and a local harness map 540.¹ The local harness map 540

¹ See Yoon, at column 6, lines 27-35 and 59-62 and in Figure 5.

displays a portion of the global harness map 530 indicated by indicators 531 and 532 in the global harness map 530.²

However, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination of references does not disclose or suggest “h) switching back and forth between the first view and the second view such that, in the first view, the valid routings between the zones are displayed without showing the valid routings within the zones and, in the second view, the valid routings within the zones are displayed,” as recited in amended Claim 9.

Instead, as can be seen in Figures 2-5 of Yamashita, once the lines have been routed, they are displayed in all views. Accordingly, even assuming that modifying Shropshire and Alibozek to include the first view of Yamashita and the second view of Yoon is proper, when switching from the second view of Yoon back to the first view of Yamashita, all of the routings would be displayed in both views. Specifically, nothing in either reference teaches hiding the routings within the zones when switching back to the first view.

Thus, even though the Office Action appears to interpret Yamashita as not showing routings before the routings are applied, this interpretation would not hold true once the user of the cited combination switches back and forth between the second view *which shows all of the routings* and the first view since the first view would also now show all of the routings.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination does not disclose or suggest every feature recited in independent Claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 9, and all claims dependent thereon, as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita and Yoon be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 15 and 16, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 9. Thus, it is also respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 15 and 16, and all claims dependent thereon, as

² See Yoon, at column 7, lines 21-24 and in Figure 5.

unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita and Yoon be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 25, it is noted that these claims depend on independent Claims 9, 15, and 16, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 9, 15, and 16. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ozaki does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the combination of Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita and Yoon. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 25 also be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 29, the Office Action relies on Ida as describing the claimed plurality of zones. However, the components shown in Figure 6 of Ida are of an actual car, and not a display. Ida is silent with regards to graphically representing these components on a display or displaying the wiring routings of the various components. Accordingly, without the hindsight bias from reviewing the present application, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious based on Ida to display the plurality of zones in the shape of parts of a car. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 29 as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, Yamashita, and Yoon, and further in view of Ida be withdrawn.


New Claim 30 is added by the present Amendment. Support for new Claim 30 can be found in Figures 13 and 14, and their corresponding description. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Further, new Claim 30 depends on independent Claim 9 and recites that “the switching includes changing a shape of each of the zones between the first view and the second view.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest changing the shape of each of the zones when switching between views. Accordingly, new Claim 30 is believed to patentably define over the cited references.

Consequently, in view of the present Amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Colin B. Harris
Registration No. 58,969